

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2-25 are canceled.

Claims 26-37 are new.

Support for the amended claim, and the new claims, is found at the originally filed claims and throughout the specification.

Upon entry of the amendment, Claims 1 and 26-37 will be active.

No new matter is believed to have been added.

The non-elected Claims 5-23 have been canceled.

Applicants have added new method claims that depend from the Claim 1, which Applicants submit is allowable. Applicants respectfully request, should the Office find Claim 1 to be allowable, that the new method claims be rejoined and examined.

Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of Claims 1-4 and 24-25 as being anticipated by Kawaguchi. The rejection of Claims 2-4 and 24-25 is obviated by cancellation of these claims.

The invention of Claim 1 is different from Kawaguchi because Kawaguchi requires a fibril filler diameter from 5 to 100  $\mu\text{m}$  (please see col. 3, lines 60-62) whereas Claim 1 requires a diameter of the acicular filler to be from 0.5 to 2.0  $\mu\text{m}$ . Since Kawaguchi neither describes or suggests that the fibril filler diameter be from 0.5 to 2.0  $\mu\text{m}$ , as described in Claim 1, Applicants submit the instant invention is not anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Kawaguchi.

Additionally, while Kawaguchi describes an aspect ratio genus (i.e., that the aspect ratio is at least three (please see col. 3, line 60)), there is no description or suggestion of the species aspect ratio found in instant Claim 1 of from 20-50.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 1-4 and 24-25 as being obvious over Chheang or Hanrahan in view of Kawaguchi II is respectfully traversed. The rejection of Claims 2-4 and 24-25 is obviated by cancellation of these claims. Kawaguchi II does not describe or suggest the limitations of instant Claim 1 that the diameter of the acicular filler be from 0.5 to 2.0  $\mu\text{m}$ , and that aspect ratio be from 20-50.

The instant invention of Claim 1 provides for a filler having a small diameter (0.5 to 2.0  $\mu\text{m}$ ) and a high aspect ratio. Kawaguchi II does not describe or suggest this combination of diameter and aspect ratio, nor does Kawaguchi II describe or suggest that the use of this filler results in good conductivity with the use of significantly less filler (please see figure 3).

Accordingly, Kawaguchi II, either alone, or in combination with Chheang or Hanrahan, does not describe or suggest the invention of Claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office's contentions that choosing the shape and amount of the conductive filler are obvious, and that a fiber strand "normally" would have a length of at least 5 times more than the diameter.

Regarding the first point, if it would have been obvious to realize the conductivity achieved by the Applicants, with significantly decreased filler, using the claimed aspect ratio and diameter range, this would have been described in some piece of cited art, and such description is clearly lacking. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office is merely opining and any element of obviousness is only possible with the hindsight of the Applicants' invention.

Concerning the second point, that a fiber strand normally would have a length of at least 5 times more than the diameter, the un-tenability of the position is evident from the wording of the sentence. That a fiber strand "normally" would have a length of at least 5

times more than the diameter means that some fiber strands would be expected to have a length of at least 5 times the diameter, and that some fiber strands that were not "normal" would have a diameter of less than or equal to 5 times the diameter. Since the Office's statement covers all fiber strands, there is no motivation or suggestion to pick fiber strands, from the entire universe of fiber strands, with the particular set of physical limitations as described in Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and early notification thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Richard L. Treanor  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 36,379

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Charles J. Andres, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 57,537